

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



# rural development



5

MAR 2 1977

U.S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

Financial and Technical Assistance Provided by the  
Department of Agriculture and the  
Department of Housing and Urban Development  
for  
Nonmetropolitan Planning Districts  
in Fiscal Year  
**1976**

Seventh Annual Report to Congress  
(Pursuant to Title IX, Section 901  
of the Agricultural Act of 1970)

## CONTENTS

	Page
Summary .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Federally Assisted Planning Programs .....	2
Resource Conservation and Development Areas .....	2
Economic Development Districts .....	3
Comprehensive Planning .....	4
Health Service Areas .....	5
Area Agencies on Aging .....	6
Title XX - Social Service Programs .....	7
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration .....	7
Water-Quality Planning .....	8
Planning in the Appalachian Region .....	9
State-Oriented Programs .....	9
Air-Quality Planning .....	9
Outdoor Recreation Planning .....	10
Energy Policy and Conservation Planning .....	10
Coastal Zone Management .....	10
Manpower Planning .....	10
Transportation Planning .....	10
Case Studies .....	10
Georgia Mountains Area Planning and Development Commission .....	10
Rogue Valley Council of Governments .....	11
Southern Iowa Regional Planning Agency .....	12
USDA Community Development Role .....	14
Forest Service .....	14
Cooperative Extension Service .....	14
Economic Research Service .....	15
Farmers Home Administration .....	16
Rural Development Service .....	16
Rural Electrification Administration .....	16
Soil Conservation Service .....	17
Rural Development Committees .....	18
Representative State Rural Development Committee Activities ....	18
Alabama - Cleburne County Rural Development Committee and East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission .....	18
Utah Rural Development Committee .....	19
Nebraska Rural Development Committee .....	20
Iowa Rural Development Committee .....	21
Table 1 -- Technical and educational services of USDA and cooperating State agencies in support of nonmetropolitan planning districts, fiscal year 1976 .....	23
Table 2 -- Nonmetropolitan Planning Districts .....	24

FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE  
DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
FOR NONMETROPOLITAN PLANNING DISTRICTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1976

SUMMARY

In fiscal year 1976, the Department of Housing and Urban Development extended grants totaling \$8,504,680 to 46 States for planning programs of 285 nonmetropolitan districts under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1968. Through its field staffs and those of associated State agencies, the Department of Agriculture contributed an estimated 437.4 man-years of professional and administrative services in the provision of technical assistance, both in the organizing and operation of district programs.

INTRODUCTION

Substate planning districts have begun to feel the effects of Federal efforts to coordinate and rationalize the requirements of Federal planning programs. These efforts have been particularly salutary in rural areas where grants are smaller and the relative efficiencies realized from shared organizational structures and shared professional staffs can be great.

The principal tool for accomplishing this coordination has been the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) A-95 clearinghouse review process, particularly Part IV of A-95. Part IV provides for, among other things, the utilization by Federal agencies of common or consistent planning and development districts, and the development of agreements between diverse planning agencies as to how coordination is to be accomplished. Where boundaries do coincide, the tendency to use the same administrative agency is strong. Investigations reveal that 50 percent of the planning dollars made available through selected planning programs are spent within boundaries delineated by the substate districting system. Of that 50 percent, 90 percent is channelled through the same administrative agency.

A second important coordinative trend is the development at the Federal level of memoranda of agreement on related Federal planning programs regarding acceptance of joint work programs and joint funding of projects. These agreements typically provide that, to the extent permissible by law, elements of work programs of one planning program will be accepted as satisfying the relevant requirements of the other. The effect of this is that a single project will enjoy funding from a number of different Federal sources. This is not to say that funding is duplicative. Work items for different planning programs are identified separately and funding is targeted to specific work items.

The effects of these coordination efforts are felt to varying degrees in different parts of the country. Much remains to be done to fully rationalize the system, notably the standardization or consolidation of rules and regulations, unification of application procedures, and standardization of fiscal accounting procedures. Also, more emphasis on integrative policy planning would greatly enhance coordination within the functional planning process.



Technically, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds under Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 can be used for policy planning, but statutory requirements for housing and land-use planning effectively preclude the diversion of 701 funds for overall policy planning at the substate district level. <sup>1/</sup>

As a result, rural substate districts which are not within the Appalachian Region or which do not meet the special requirements of the Economic Development Administration (EDA) frequently do little explicit overall policy planning. The special usefulness of these programs derives from the fact that they cover administrative costs.

Progress is being made, however, and especially in rural areas substate districts are increasingly becoming involved in the full range of governmental activities. In addition to bearing the responsibility of federally funded planning programs, the districts are being relied upon and funded by State and local governments not only for planning but also for actual service delivery. In many cases, this may result from the fact that they represent the only local governmental organization with substantial professional and managerial skills available.

The following sections provide a perspective on the cohesiveness of planning in rural areas by describing relevant features of the Federal planning programs which affect rural areas and by presenting case studies of a number of district efforts to administer these programs in a unified fashion.

#### FEDERALLY ASSISTED PLANNING PROGRAMS

##### Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Areas

RC&D program assistance is provided to authorized multicounty areas by agencies of the Department of Agriculture (USDA), under the administrative leadership of the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). RC&D areas are organized and directed by sponsoring local units of government; i.e., county governments, conservation districts, towns, etc. The sponsoring units of government make application for RC&D program assistance to USDA. Designations of areas to receive assistance are made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Application for RC&D program assistance must have the endorsement of the governor (or his designated agency). OMB Circular A-95 procedures must be followed. Policies of USDA require that RC&D areas designated for assistance will conform to established substate districts, unless there is clear justification for not doing so.

---

<sup>1/</sup> The 701 comprehensive planning and management program is the Federal government's principal instrument for improving the capacity of State and local governments to handle complex rural development issues, and for supporting the development of comprehensive development plans. The results of 701-supported areawide development efforts have encouraged regional council involvement in such activities as attracting new industry, jobs, and tourism; in addressing zoning, land-use, and physical development issues; and in responding to health, law enforcement, nutrition, and housing needs.

Areawide comprehensive planning agencies are requested to participate. RC&D councils and areawide comprehensive planning boards enter into jointly developed memoranda of agreement setting forth arrangements for cooperation and coordination of activities. In some authorized RC&D areas, the areawide comprehensive planning body and the RC&D area organization are the same body.

Financial and technical assistance is provided to authorized RC&D areas. Financial assistance may be provided for a portion of the cost of planned measures for purposes such as erosion and sediment control, flood prevention, farm irrigation systems, public water-based recreation developments, and public water-based fish and wildlife developments. All measures must have community benefits. The average RC&D financial assistance grant per measure completed in fiscal year 1975 was about \$90,000.

### Economic Development Districts

EDA provides grants averaging \$40,000 to \$45,000 to Economic Development Districts (EDD's) to do economic development planning. EDD's are delineated and created by the States. The State must request authorization of the districts by EDA and must approve an overall economic development plan. State delineation of EDD's is limited by the EDA requirement that the counties included must be in economic distress and have a growth center capable of providing relief. The boundaries of the EDD's generally match substate district boundaries.

Designation as an EDD creates eligibility for EDA development grants and other Federal grant programs. Consequently, EDD's are sometimes designated without receiving an EDA planning grant. Also, EDD's are sometimes funded at a minimal level more to maintain organizational capacity than to fund activities. These EDA planning grants are then used to generate other grants.

EDD's are guided by policy boards and are incorporated under the laws governing nonprofit organizations (as opposed to joint exercise of powers laws, under which many councils of government (COG's) are incorporated). A minimum of 51 percent of the members of the policy boards must be local elected officials. However, local elected officials may not make up more than two-thirds of the board membership. EDD boards are specifically prohibited from being made up entirely of local elected officials (COG's), because it is felt that the goal of the EDD's cannot be achieved without the cooperation and direct participation of the business community. To that end, the boards are required to be broadly representative of the principal economic interests of the district. A minimum of one-third of the board membership is reserved for representatives of business, labor, agriculture, minorities, the unemployed, and the underemployed. Districts are required to maintain a professional staff and the makeup of both the board and the staff must correlate with the makeup of the population served.

Beyond the routine coordination accomplished through the A-95 process, EDD's are specifically required to conduct their planning activities in concert with the planning activities of others. EDA will not fund duplicative work, but will

fund projects jointly with other Federal programs. Where projects are funded jointly, work items must be separately identified. EDA provides 75 percent of project costs. The matching 25 percent may not be Federal money, but noncash credits are permitted.

Although EDD's are designated by the governor, 75 percent of the counties within the designated district must commit themselves to support the EDD's activities. Organizational overlap between EDD's and other Federal planning programs is high. Forty new EDD's will be designated as of this transitional quarter (July-September 1976), and all of these will use existing organizations which are already getting other Federal funds.

### Comprehensive Planning

The HUD comprehensive planning assistance program, under Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, provides funds for the development of a comprehensive planning and management process with emphasis on land-use and housing planning. Recipients are statutorily required to have incorporated land-use and housing elements into their comprehensive planning process by August 1977. Since 701 grants to nonmetropolitan agencies are relatively small (the average grant is less than \$20,000) most 701 money will be used to satisfy this requirement. It is interesting to note that where communities under 50,000 population applied for HUD community development discretionary funds, the housing assistance plan which is required to be submitted with that application was prepared by the 701 areawide planning agency in almost every case.

Only nonmetropolitan planning agencies which are COG's are eligible to apply directly to HUD for planning assistance funds. For 701 purposes, a COG is an areawide agency with a policy board consisting entirely of local elected officials. Since satisfying this requirement would render an agency ineligible for EDA funds, very few nonmetropolitan planning agencies establish themselves under HUD's definition of a COG. Virtually all such agencies receive 701 funds through the States.

The boundaries of 701 planning areas are coterminus with substate district boundaries and all are designated as A-95 review agencies. The minimum permissible local elected official representation on policy boards is two-thirds, the balance being appointed or elected-at-large officials. A minimum of 75 percent of the population within each agency's jurisdiction must be represented on the board.

The 701 program has in effect coordination agreements for coastal zone management (CZM), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), EDA, and the Federal Energy Administration (FEA), and is in the process of developing such agreements with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR), Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Corps of Engineers. These agreements will result in the sharing of work programs and the joint funding of projects. Further coordination is accomplished through the A-95 process, and the sharing of administrative agencies and boards of directors.



## Health Service Areas

Health service areas are the building blocks of the national health planning and development system. Health service areas are established by the State and proposed to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for approval. Boundaries for health service areas are set along the lines of medical trade areas. A health service area in general must include within its jurisdiction a population of at least 500,000 and not more than 3 million, with populations as low as 200,000 permissible under certain circumstances. (If the population of an entire State is less than 500,000, for example, the State need not go outside its boundaries to make up the requisite population base.) Other constraints on the boundaries of health service areas are the boundaries of professional standards and review organizations, which must be honored, and the boundaries of other emergency health services. The boundaries tend, in general, to follow those of their predecessor comprehensive health planning agencies.

The national health planning and development network includes the National Council on Health Planning and Development, which is charged with setting national health policy, 50 State health coordinating councils, which serve as advisory groups to State health planning and resource development agencies, and 200 health service areas. States also are required to develop plans for health service delivery, but these plans are required to be consistent with the plans of the constituent health service areas.

Health service areas are administered by health systems agencies selected at the regional level by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) on the basis of application review. A wide variety of public and private non-profit agencies are eligible to apply. Agencies chosen to administer the program have tended to be private nonprofit agencies. These agencies are guided by policy boards, the membership of which consists of designated providers of health services (designated in the legislation), and consumers. The proposed members are identified in the application for health systems agency designation. A-95 applies, but no other coordination with other function or comprehensive planning programs is mandated.

This system of area and agency designation results in the dominance of urban interests in health planning and service delivery. The population base requirement makes it difficult for an entirely rural area to qualify as a health service area. As a result, rural areas are assigned to metropolitan areas in the boundary delineation process. Since rural representation on policy boards is not required, strengthening planning coordination requirements would increase the access of rural interests to the making of health policy. Few, if any, of the health service areas are coterminous with State districts for planning purposes. A health systems agency may establish subarea advisory councils representing parts of the agency's health service area to advise the governing body of the agency on the performance of its functions.

## Area Agencies on Aging

Under Title III of the Older Americans Act, there are approximately 501 area agencies on aging. Title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, is a Federal-State formula grant program to encourage and assist State and local agencies to concentrate resources in order to foster the development of comprehensive and coordinated service systems to serve older persons. The overall objective of the Title III program is to strengthen or to develop at the substate or area level a system of coordinated and comprehensive services, which will enable older people to live in their own homes or communities as long as possible.

To participate in this program, State agencies must prepare and execute an annual State-operating plan, including plans for implementation of steps toward comprehensive and coordinated services for older people in the States and evaluation of progress toward that objective.

The plan must first receive approval by the governor of the State and then be submitted to the commissioner on aging for his approval. In implementing the plan, a State agency must first divide the entire State into planning and service areas, taking into consideration: (1) the geographical distribution of persons aged 60 years or older (including the number of low-income and minority elderly); (2) the need for social services and the distribution of resources to meet such need; (3) the boundaries of existing areas within the State drawn for planning or administration of social services programs; (4) and the location of units of general-purpose local government.

The State agency must then designate area agencies on aging to develop and implement area plans for a selected number of planning and service areas within the State. Area plans are then submitted by the area agencies to the State agency for approval, and upon such approval, become part of the annual State operating plan. Each area agency on aging is charged with the following major responsibilities:

1. To become a focal point for leadership in the field of aging for its planning and service area.
2. To engage in a continuous process of planning in order to define or redefine objectives and to establish priorities and develop a system designed to improve the delivery of services.
3. To make provision for an action program designed to coordinate the delivery of existing services for older persons.
4. To make provision for an action program designed to pool available but untapped resources from both the public and private sectors in order to strengthen existing or to inaugurate new services.
5. To take steps, in cooperation with State agencies on aging, designed to achieve the establishment or maintenance of information and referral sources in sufficient numbers to assure that all older persons within the area will have reasonably convenient access to such sources.

6. To enter into contracts or to make grants for inaugurating or strengthening supporting and gap-filling services for older persons.
7. To monitor and assess and conduct periodic evaluations of activities carried out under its auspices.
8. To develop comprehensive and coordinated programs for older persons throughout the planning and service area.

## Title XX - Social Service Programs

Under the Title XX amendments to the Social Security Act of 1974, State social service programs are primarily shaped at the State level in determining what services will be available, which people will be eligible to receive the services, and where and how the services will be provided. Under Title XX, the content of the State service plan is subject to review by the State's citizens.

To assure that citizens have an opportunity to review the State services plan, the law requires an open planning process. This includes a public review and comment period of at least 45 days. In reviewing the proposed services plan, citizens can comment on whether it makes the best use of Statewide resources in light of competing priorities, based upon summaries which appear in local newspapers, discussed at local community organization meetings that take part in local social services programs, or through participation in public hearings on the proposed service plan.

The social services provided under Title XX must be directed to at best one of the following five goals: (1) to help people become or remain economically self-supporting; (2) to help people become or remain self-sufficient by being able to take care of themselves; (3) to protect children and adults who cannot protect themselves from abuse, neglect, and exploitation and to help families stay together; (4) to prevent and reduce inappropriate institutional care as much as possible by making home and community services available; and (5) to arrange for appropriate placement and services in an institution when this is in an individual's best interest.

The Federal government can pay 90 percent of the family planning cost and 75 percent of all other social services program costs up to the State's allotment. The rest must come from within the State, from State and local appropriations, from funds donated by individual foundations, and from organizations concerned with community services.

## Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)

The law enforcement and criminal justice program is a block grant program which allocates funds by formula to States. States are required to establish a planning agency and to develop a comprehensive plan for law enforcement and criminal justice. Two kinds of grants are made: one for agency operations and one for action programs.



Forty percent of the funds allocated to the State must be passed through to local governments or combinations of local governments. The agencies responsible for local planning, and the basis upon which funds are allocated to local planning units are determined by the State. If areawide planning units are used, these agencies must be supported by advisory committees representative of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. A majority of the advisory committee members must be local elected officials (including judges and sheriffs where such officials are elected), and membership may include citizens and other professionals. The State planning agency also is served by an advisory committee, but majority elected official representation is not required at the State level.

States do, in general, use existing areawide organizations as administrative agencies, with advisory committees established as subcommittees of these agencies. Where areawide agencies do not blanket the States, and the State has identified the need in a given area for a locally administered law enforcement and criminal justice program, new organizations are established. New organizations also are established where areawide organizations overlap State boundaries, even if the national service area is a multistate region. Rural areas frequently are attached to the closest metropolitan area in the boundary delineation process, even if the rural area does not belong to the dominant Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Rural areas which do not belong to a COG are sometimes served by a State-planned and implemented program.

LEAA's coordination activities are dictated by the fact that its program is covered by A-95 and by the Joint Funding Simplification Act. In accordance with Section 4 of A-95, LEAA administrative agencies are required to develop memoranda of agreement with the A-95 review agencies specifying how coordination is to be accomplished. LEAA also participates in Federal Regional Council efforts to improve coordination.

### Water-Quality Planning

This program originally was targeted to urban areas, but a recent court case resulted in the decision that all areas of the Nation had to be served by water-quality plans. States are responsible for designating planning areas and administrative agencies. Areas for which an administrative agency is not designated (most rural areas fall into this category) are served by the State. States are responsible for setting water-quality standards, ensuring the compatibility of plans, and ensuring that plans are carried out. If a designated areawide agency defaults in carrying out its responsibility, the State becomes the responsible management agency.

To date, 176 water-quality planning areas have been designated. Although boundaries may be modified by hydrological problems, area designations generally follow COG, regional planning agency, or county government boundaries. Substate districts are sometimes combined for water-quality planning purposes, but since the law requires that there be one administrative agency per planning area, an executive board of the constituent commissions is formed for water-quality planning purposes.

Administrative agencies are served by policy advisory committees which must be representative of the area served. They must consist of 50 percent or more local elected officials, and some members may be gubernatorial appointees. Coordination with other federally assisted planning programs is required.

### Planning in the Appalachian Region

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) was established to encourage an areawide approach to planning and development in the Appalachian Region. Current ARC emphasis is on plan implementation. Its strategy is to build on the overall economic development plan process of the districts funded by EDA and the soil conservation and development programs of SCS. The objective is to develop a single areawide planning and development process, which meets the requirements of as many agencies as possible, and a single program in the districts.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is a multistate-Federal agency. Its basic membership is the governors of the 13 Appalachian States. In delineating the region, Congress did not include its major urban areas, so it tends to be the smaller metropolitan and rural areas of the States. The one exception to this is the city of Pittsburgh, which is included.

The governors designate local development districts to administer ARC funds. Since cohesiveness of development planning and implementation activities is a stated objective of ARC, the designated administrative agencies tend to be those conducting a number of other federally assisted planning programs, notably EDA, HUD, and the A-95 review agencies.

### STATE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

There are a number of federally funded planning programs for which the States have responsibility but which significantly affect substate districts because the States use districts for review, data gathering, and monitoring of delegate plan development and implementation authority to the districts. These programs do not have structural impacts on the agencies, but they affect the agencies' budgets, availability of professional staffs, and relationships with local governments.

#### Air-Quality Planning

The Clean Air Act requires States to develop plans to meet established air-quality standards. The plans must have land-use and transportation components, and they must include provisions for both attaining and maintaining standard air quality. The provision which most directly affects rural areas is that prohibiting significant deterioration of the quality of air which is already above the minimum standard. Under this provision, preconstruction proposals for 19 industries are reviewed for possible new sources of pollution.

The Act does not require districting, but coordination of air-quality maintenance plans with local governments is required and somewhat over half of the States use the substate district system for this purpose.



### Outdoor Recreation Planning

The Department of the Interior's BOR provides funds to States for the development of Statewide comprehensive outdoor recreation plans (SCORP's). A-95 clearinghouse review and coordination with other planning entities is required. Some States also delegate actual planning authority to substate planning districts.

### Energy Policy and Conservation Planning

The Federal Energy Administration (FEA) provides funds for the development of State energy conservation plans. It is expected that States will choose to use districts for development and implementation of these plans, for energy facility siting studies, and for research projects or methodology of energy planning.

### Coastal Zone Management

This is a State-oriented program designed to provide technical and financial assistance to States in developing comprehensive management programs to control land and water usage in designated coastal zones. There is virtually no contact with substate planning agencies at the Federal level, but the States do rely on local planning agencies for the development of the program.

### Manpower Planning (CETA)

These funds are allocated as block grants to prime sponsors (cities and counties of population 100,000 or more). Funds for other cities and counties are administered by the State. Many States use substate planning districts as the delivery mechanism.

### Transportation Planning

DOT has two programs which affect substate planning agencies: the rural highway public demonstration program jointly funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) and the Urban Mass Transit Authority (UMTA), and \$500 million of UMTA funds set aside for capital expenditures, in nonurbanized areas, for planning and demonstration programs. Nonmetropolitan planning districts have received funds under both of these programs.

## CASE STUDIES

### Georgia Mountains Area Planning and Development Commission, Gainesville

This is the largest nonmetropolitan planning district in the country in terms of budget and staff. The agency's budget for fiscal year 1977 is \$3.6 million and it employs 175 persons. Its jurisdiction includes 13 cities and counties, and the agency is guided by a 29-member board: 13 city representatives, 13 county representatives, and 3 minority group appointees. The board is 84 percent local elected officials. They serve a population of approximately 200,000 covering 12,000 square miles.

In addition to administering 701 funds for both the local assistance and the areawide comprehensive planning program, the Commission administers planning programs funded by EDA, HEW, ARC, DOT, LEAA, BOR, and the State of Georgia with multiple grants. Each grant represents a separate program and separate books are maintained for each program. The Commission may file as many as 25 different applications in a single year. Overall program planning and administrative costs are covered by an administrative grant from ARC.

The Commission had been a 314b comprehensive health planning agency. It applied for health systems agency designation under the new Health Services Act but could not get the necessary waiver of the 500,000 population base requirement. As a result, its health-planning activity will terminate shortly. This will not result in a reduction in staff or budget because the activity will be replaced by a contract with the Georgia Department of Human Resource Planning. This new planning activity will be coordinated with the health systems agency.

In addition to its planning activities, the Commission also is deeply involved in actual service delivery. It operates a nutrition program, child development and family day care centers, a regional computer-based information system, a transportation service for school children and senior citizens, and a health screening program for preschool children. Authorization for operating a commuter transit system is expected shortly. Services are provided only at the request of local governments, but from the perspective of the citizens, the services are identified with the Commission.

The Commission receives \$300,000 of local government funds, \$100,000 in State funds, \$600,000 in direct Federal assistance, and \$2.4 million in Federal pass-through funds. The Commission has observed the tendency of State government to siphon off more and more program funds for administrative purposes. It therefore suggests that some of the savings realized at the Federal level from delegating these administrative responsibilities to the States should be shared with the States to support their growing bureaucracies. Then the States would not have to rely on program funds for this purpose.

The major coordinative difficulties experienced by this agency are the number of applications to be filed each year and the compartmentalized fiscal management system. In general, however, the Commission is a well-established public agency which is making its presence felt in the intergovernmental arena.

#### Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Medford, Oregon

The Rogue Valley COG is a two-county area covering 6,000 square miles. Jackson and Josephine Counties include 13 cities, 36 special districts, and 150,000 people. They are located along an urbanizing corridor in which 75 percent of the land is owned by the Federal government--Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (FS). This has important implications for the economy of the region, because nearly 19 percent of the revenue generated by the forests on the BLM-owned land goes back to the counties.

The Rogue Valley COG is the administrative agency for 701 comprehensive planning, 208 water-quality planning, criminal justice and law enforcement planning, planning for the aged, and manpower planning funds. It is the A-95 review agency, and although it receives no EDA funds, it is designated economic development district. This designation establishes the eligibility of constituent jurisdictions for EDA development grants. In addition, the COG has received UMTA funds to do a special transit study.

The COG's budget is \$475,708, administered through six accounts: a COG membership account, and an account for each of the five planning programs. In addition, it handles \$1,231,382 in local government pass-through funds.

The board of directors consists of a chairman and a vice chairman, each of whom is mayor of a member city, and an elected official representing each of the other jurisdictions. The COG professional staff includes a director who is also the planner in charge for 701, an office manager/fiscal officer, an LEAA planner, a water-quality planner, an aging planner, and a CETA program coordinator. This staff is supported by four secretary/bookkeepers, a secretary, and a bookkeeper.

Coordination in the Rogue Valley COG is accomplished primarily by the use of one administrative agency for a number of planning programs. The coordinative potential of this arrangement is somewhat reduced by the lack of overall program or policy planning reinforced by separate staff assignments and advisory committees. The COG used 701 funds to develop an overall program design. This document is not updated, so there is no preliminary process through which all of the planning programs are related to each other. As urbanization in the Rogue Valley proceeds, and as planning needs become more complex, a mechanism will have to be developed to accomplish this integration of planning activities.

#### Southern Iowa Regional Planning Agency, Creston

Southern Iowa is a seven-county region of 61,000 population. The regional planning agency serving this area employs 76 people and operates on a budget of \$608,000. It is a "full-service COG" involved in planning, programming, and service delivery. The services provided by the COG are identified with the COG.

The Agency administers 10 programs funded by five different Federal agencies. It administers local 701 and EDA funds, but does not receive a significant amount of money from the State. Iowa is not strong in its support of substate districts and does not in general delegate State authorities and responsibilities to them. The State legislation governing substate districts is permissive, leaving the entire matter to local discretion. Once established, these districts may exercise the full range of municipal powers so long as that exercise is agreed to in writing by the municipalities involved. Therefore, substate districts in Iowa have the potential to become general-purpose governments.



The Agency started out as a soil conservation and development council (SC&D). The decision to seek 701 funds made it necessary to reconstruct the policy board to include a majority of local elected officials. The requirement of USDA that soil conservation district commissioners be on SC&D district boards and the district's desire to unify the 701 and SC&D policy boards precluded the establishment of the district as a COG according to HUD's definition (an areawide council of local elected officials). Consequently, the Agency must receive its 701 funds from the State. (It also receives a grant of State 701 funds to do housing planning, and it administers 701 local assistance funds.)

The board experienced another restructuring when it was certified by EDA. To satisfy EDA requirements, it was necessary to add to the board representatives of the major economic interests in the area. It is interesting to note that although the SC&D district has a separate administrative agency, it is guided by the same policy board. The effect of this is that policy for the SC&D district is set by the regional planning agency.

A very well articulated policy planning system operates to integrate and unify the planning and service delivery activities of the Agency. Mini-COG's at the county level conduct annual needs assessments (reviewed at public hearings) and develop a list of priority areas. These priority areas become the basis for the annual work program developed by the regional planning agency. This work program then becomes the basis for the applications developed by the Agency. Although the funds received are accounted for separately on the books, they are combined for planning and management purposes. One audit procedure is used and one bookkeeper is employed. This policy planning process is paid for with 701 and EDA funds.

The work of the Agency is assisted by five advisory committees, regarded as its functional planning and development arms. Two advisory committees have become separately constituted regional authorities: the water association and the regional housing authority. In addition, the Agency is served by an economic developing committee, an aging advisory council, and RC&D project council.

The reason for having the Agency is local need; consequently, differing Federal regulations and application procedures and differing reporting requirements and payment systems have not impeded the rational development of the Agency. Attempts to accommodate the differing Federal demands have had an impact on the Agency's structure. This continues to generate certain administrative inconveniences, but the Agency has managed to develop into a cohesive, well-managed, and effective public service organization.

## USDA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ROLE

The Rural Development Act of 1972 gave USDA greater responsibilities than any other Federal department in the area of nonmetropolitan community development. During fiscal year 1976, USDA agencies continued their efforts to fulfill these obligations. Projects supported by USDA include land-use planning and provision of planning and development information; installation and extension of electric and telephone systems; construction and improvement of water and sewer facilities; resource development and conservation; and agricultural production and marketing programs. Despite occasional communication difficulties, USDA and local planning and development personnel have been able to work effectively together to successfully implement programs for rural community development.

Programs of the following USDA agencies are of special interest and importance to the process of regional planning and development:

### Forest Service (FS)

By means of Intergovernmental Personnel Act agreements and cooperative agreements with State foresters, FS has placed forest resource planners on the staffs of State and substate planning organizations. These personnel assist in the identification and analysis of multiple forest resource values in comprehensive plans. Forest resource advice and assistance is supplied upon request.

### Cooperative Extension Service (CES)

In concert with USDA's Extension Service (ES), the State land-grant university CES systems provide organizational and educational assistance to nonmetropolitan planning agencies. With a field staff of county and in some cases area agents in each of the substate planning and development districts, Extension works directly with citizen groups by helping them to understand community problems, issues, and alternatives. One focus has been on the role of comprehensive planning as a means of orderly growth and development. Major attention has been directed toward those developmental goals that can best be achieved through multicounty coordinated and concerted efforts.

During fiscal year 1976, joint planning district-Extension conferences and workshops were conducted on land-use planning, industrial development, waste disposal, housing, health facilities and services, and transportation. In these and other joint undertakings, Extension has brought knowledge to bear upon the problems and alternative solutions. Planning districts have provided planning, technical, and financial services.

State and district planning personnel have served with Extension on rural development committees. Also, representatives of State planning offices have served, along with State Extension administration personnel, on Title V councils which plan and implement the university-sponsored research and education component of the Rural Development Act. During fiscal year 1976, additional



planning and development districts were served by area Extension community resource development agents. In its program of assistance to local governments, Extension has helped planning districts facilitate local action in support of area or district projects.

### Economic Research Service (ERS)

This agency conducts research and disseminates information on the economic factors affecting commercial agriculture and rural community life. Multicounty district information files have been developed for research purposes and are periodically updated to support continuing research projects. Direct support for the RC&D program administered by SCS is provided by special studies of such activities.

ERS recognizes that multicounty planning and development districts have an important role in the development of nonmetropolitan areas. A recent ERS study shows that nonmetropolitan areas frequently lack the funds, staff, and professional resources required to identify many of the Federal assistance programs available to them. <sup>2/</sup> This study indicates that approximately 100 Federal programs provide cost-sharing assistance for development projects, but nonmetropolitan areas may need the aid of a multicounty planning organization to be able to identify and take full advantage of these programs. ERS, therefore, attempted to expand its analytical capability on nonmetropolitan planning districts during fiscal year 1976.

Under the RC&D program administered by SCS, ERS is conducting studies of: the role of various levels of government in land-use planning, capital availability as a factor in the progress of RC&D projects, the general analysis of progress in the RC&D multicounty program, and systems for generation and application of regional input-output models.

In the Great Plains area of the United States, ERS has been working closely with selected substate planning and development districts to study the need for better fire protection systems, the feasibility of low-income rental housing units, and the need for better health delivery systems, law enforcement services, and other rural community development opportunities.

ERS also continues to maintain a limited version of the Development District Information System (DDIS) it created in 1969 and 1970. DDIS originally was produced to monitor the growth, organization, and funding of multicounty planning and development districts. But now that the period of rapid organization has passed, the emphasis is being shifted to use of the system for analytical studies of multicounty service delivery systems in nonmetropolitan areas.

---

<sup>2/</sup> Agricultural Economic Report 307.

## Farmers Home Administration (FmHA)

To the extent feasible, FmHA substate districts are coterminous with substate regional planning and development districts. FmHA cooperates with State and substate multicounty regional planning and development agencies in support of efforts related to plans for development in nonmetropolitan or rural areas.

District directors and county supervisors serve on many district planning committees; FmHA continues to fund eligible projects that have district priority. FmHA has made a major contribution of funds to housing, water and sewer, and business and industrial projects sponsored by district planning organizations. The completion by nearly all districts of comprehensive water and sewer plans is cited as a major FmHA contribution in many States. In cooperation with and support of public educational activities of district organizations, FmHA participates in explaining the purpose and function of district planning agencies to local agencies and groups.

Applications made to FmHA for financial assistance for housing, community facilities, water and waste disposal facilities, and business and industrial projects are referred to the State and substate multicounty regional planning agencies responsible for A-95 clearinghouse review, for comments and recommendations as to priorities when applicable.

To increase formal cooperation between district planning organizations and organizations closely associated with FmHA in the area, the agency encourages groups of borrowers providing water and other community facilities to work in concert with the planning agencies that serve the area in which such projects are located. In terms of delivering programs locally, FmHA is assisted by clearinghouse reviews, which help provide equitable Federal fund distribution for orderly and efficient development in rural areas.

## Rural Development Service (RDS)

A Washington-based agency, RDS has primary responsibility to assist the Secretary of Agriculture in providing leadership and coordination of Federal rural development efforts. Through unique statutory authority to cross agency lines, RDS assisted about 1,500 rural communities in better utilizing and competing for available resources. Approximately 80 percent of all Federal resources available to rural communities are administered by agencies outside USDA. RDS also completed development of the Federal Assistance Programs Retrieval System (FAPRS). FAPRS is a computerized program information system designed to aid local leaders in determining the Federal aid programs for which their communities may qualify. To provide leadership in the process of rural development and for motivating local initiatives, RDS conducted two leadership training schools for approximately 200 rural leaders.

## Rural Electrification Administration (REA)

The major contribution of REA to the planning districts continues to be encouraging local electric and telephone leaders to join in the local planning process. As requested, REA provides the information and technical support needed.

Each year, REA surveys its borrowers to determine the extent to which they work with planning districts. The survey for 1975 revealed that 196 REA borrowers provided some type of assistance to 377 multicounty planning groups. This assistance generally takes the form of: providing data on electric and telephone needs and services; serving on the policy boards of planning districts; providing space in issuances to convey information to the public of district activities; and providing assistance to specific projects contained in the district plan.

As requested, the REA field staff provides electric and telephone program data to the districts and serves as liaison to REA-financed organizations. REA and its borrowers share a mutual interest with the planning districts: encouraging local leaders to participate in the planning process to help assure orderly development.

#### Soil Conservation Service (SCS)

This agency in fiscal year 1976 assisted State and local officials in the organization of planning districts in 17 States; made local arrangements to increase cooperation with 199 district agencies; and supplied information and technical services to rural areas with regard to soils interpretation, watershed data, environmental concerns, and recreation appraisals. Significant contributions were made by SCS in specific project activities being planned and/or implemented by district agencies, particularly in the areas of land-use, solid waste treatment, and housing. Over 1,000 members of soil conservation districts, resource conservation and development projects, and watershed governing bodies are serving on the boards of district planning agencies. Almost 500 SCS staff members are serving on technical advisory committees to planning agencies. Reciprocal efforts by the district planning agencies include: providing coordination for orderly planning and development of multicounty areas; eliminating duplication of activities; comprehensive planning assistance for community development; and supplying information on available program assistance.



## RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES

A major vehicle for the delivery of rural development programs is the rural development committee system. Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum 1667, November 7, 1969, established the National Rural Development Committee and USDA rural development committees in every State. These committees help shape rural development policies and priorities and coordinate action on matters pertaining to rural development with USDA agencies, other Federal agencies, State agencies, and public and private interest groups. The National Rural Development Committee is made up of the Assistant Secretary for Rural Development, the Assistant Secretary for Conservation, Research, and Education, and their deputies, and the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of 11 program agencies.

A Rural Development Staff Group provides the necessary staff support to the activities of the National Rural Development Committee. The National Committee has adopted a policy to provide support to State rural development committees, and to keep them informed on national rural development policies and other pertinent information. There are State rural development committees in every State, and many States have established multicounty and county rural development committees.

RDS provides staff leadership to the National Rural Development Committee, coordinates its activities, and provides liaison and support to State, regional, and local rural development committees.

### REPRESENTATIVE STATE RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

#### Alabama - Cleburne County Rural Development Committee and East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission

Cleburn County, Ala. (population 10,996) is strategically located approximately half way between Birmingham and Atlanta on Interstate Highway 20. Regional studies by the East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission (EARPDC), a HUD-funded substate regional planning agency serving Substate Planning Region 4, pointed out the tremendous potential for growth and development in this county. They also pointed out the importance of this county to the growth and development of the region. Situated between the Anniston SMSA and the Georgia line, Cleburne County, with its mountainous terrain, holds tremendous potential for recreation, residential, and light industrial development.

The Cleburne County Rural Development Committee, which had been working to develop this potential for a number of years, asked the EARPDC in 1974 to assist the county governing body in developing a comprehensive plan to help guide development. However, the necessary research upon which plans are based is expensive, so EARPDC asked the county for additional funds to develop the plan. The funds requested were to be used by EARPDC to match additional funds from the HUD 701 local planning assistance program. However, the county Commission did not have the necessary money.

Rather than give up, the Committee and EARPDC continued to explore alternative ways of obtaining this important document. Upon the recommendation of the Committee, the county, using funds from the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, hired a local person as county planner, who also became a member of the Committee. The Committee and EARPDC pooled abilities and jointly developed the comprehensive plan. The Commission provided, at no cost to the county, guidance and technical expertise. Various subcommittees of the Committee assumed responsibility for gathering certain portions of the required data. The county planner coordinated the subcommittee's work. At each monthly meeting of the Committee, its members and representatives of EARPDC discussed progress on the various sections of the plan. As each section was completed, the Committee sponsored public meetings to inform county residents of the findings and to get their ideas on goal setting and implementation procedures. Regular, formal reports on the plan's progress were made to the Commission. The Commission was further involved through its two members on the Committee.

The plan was completed in May 1976 and submitted to the State Planning Office and HUD for review. This review was not required because no outside funds were used but was requested by the Committee to ensure that the plan met HUD standards for grant-in-aid programs. Reviewers at both agencies said that the plan was more than adequate and that it reflected far more local participation than any plan they had reviewed.

Cleburne County citizens now have a low-cost, comprehensive plan that reflects their wishes to guide development activities and stimulate programs within the county. EARPDC is further toward its goal of developing comprehensive plans for counties within its region. It also has a local group aware of the planning process and capable of providing inputs to the regional planning program.

#### Utah Rural Development Committee

The Wasatch Front Regional Council of Governments (WFRC) requested through its technical committee (consisting of county planners) a map showing the suitability of undeveloped land for agricultural purposes. The map would include the major portion of the five-county council area.

The Wasatch Front Rural Development Committee (WFRDC) holds regular monthly meetings. A staff director of the WFRC attended these meetings. At one of the meetings, the WFRC staff director indicated a need for accurate information regarding the location of prime agricultural lands in the five-county area. Without such information local officials could not make wise land-use plans. Noncompatible maps were in use in the different counties, thus making a regional approach practically impossible.

The WFRDC agreed to accept the assignment of supplying the maps requested. It was decided to supply each county with its own map. A master copy would be made, with a master set supplied to and kept by WFRC. The maps would be compiled into an atlas by SCS and FS. Much time and effort went into this request. The information went beyond identifying prime agricultural lands; it became a complete soil survey and included interpretations of suitability for agricultural purposes. Seven one-half minute quad maps with mylar overlays



enclosed in an atlas were supplied. In addition, soils information contained in the publication "Soils Survey," which is more detailed, was included. Information for Davis, Morgan, and Weber counties has been presented. The Salt Lake County material is ready to be presented. The Tooele County information is not yet available. The maps were all presented at public meetings of the Wasatch Front Council of Governments Land Use Committee.

It is believed that the individual counties as well as WFRDC will use the information prepared and presented by the WFRDC Committee as a keystone for the land-use planning effort both on a county and regional basis.

#### Nebraska Rural Development Committee

Land-use planning has been a work area for numerous local, State, and Federal agencies for several years. The State Rural Development Committee realized that a better understanding of the involvement of each agency would be of benefit to all the agencies involved. The State Office of Planning and Programming is the Nebraska agency with primary land-use planning responsibility and is a member of the Committee.

A task force was appointed to determine USDA involvement in land-use planning. This task force decided it needed to know what was presently being done in the area of land-use planning by both Federal and State agencies in Nebraska. It decided that a survey of land-use activities was necessary. This survey was distributed to 38 State and Federal agencies thought to be involved to some degree in land-use planning. Response to the survey was good. Three categories of involvement were identified:

- Type 1. Direct involvement in the land-use planning process.
- Type 2. Provision of technical assistance or information such as soils maps, economic information, population projections, educational materials, or instruction to persons or agencies who are active participants in the land-use planning process.
- Type 3. Administering programs that have major direct or indirect effects on land use, but do not have a primary focus on land-use planning.

The inventory resulting from the survey will be maintained in loose-leaf notebook form and kept up to date. The State Office of Planning and Programming is publishing the results of the survey in a readable popularized form including illustrations. The net result is less duplication of effort and more assistance to citizens of Nebraska in land-use planning.

## Iowa Rural Development Committee

The Midcrest Area Rural Development Committee is an interagency/multi-county organization. It has 18 members representing 8 agencies, i.e., Iowa State University Extension Service, Southern Iowa Resource Conservation and Development Project, SCS, USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, FmHA, Southern Iowa Council of Governments (the nonmetropolitan planning agency), Iowa Conservation Commission, Iowa Development Commission, and eight counties--Adair, Adams, Clarke, Decatur, Madison, Ringgold, Taylor, and Union.

In the integrated grant administration program (IGA) application for fiscal year 1976, the Southern Iowa Council of Governments (SICOG) listed the need for rural water as the highest priority in that nonmetropolitan planning district. The need for a rural water system was verified in a 1975 research report entitled "A Planning Strategy for Rural Water Systems: A Case Study in Southern Iowa," by R. Al Austin and Gary J. Patton of the Engineering Research Institute of Iowa State University. The study was done for the State Office of Planning and Programming and funded through a comprehensive planning grant from HUD under Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954.

In the conclusion of the report, it was stated that: "The quality of the water currently being used by rural residents in the SICOG area generally is below current standards for drinking water. High nitrate levels were found in about 50 percent of the wells tested in this study. The SICOG area has only limited shallow ground water resources. Deep ground water aquifers are highly mineralized and would require expensive treatment to meet drinking water standards."

SICOG, the Midcrest Area Extension Service (CES), Southern Iowa Resource Conservation and Development Project (SCS), and FmHA have worked together through a technical assistance committee to advise the Southern Iowa Rural Water Association (SIRWA) in an attempt to provide an adequate supply of quality water to the SICOG area. SIRWA is an areawide rural water association made up of one member from each of the seven individual county rural water boards. On this technical assistance committee, Extension has served as liaison between the agencies as well as coordinator of the committee's activities. The Midcrest Area Extension Service has written numerous newspaper releases promoting rural water and reporting on the progress of SIRWA. County offices of ES, SCS, and FmHA have had the major responsibility of getting members to sign up for rural water. In a unified effort to get SIRWA organized, the above agencies were asked to draft a proposed organizational and operational plan for SIRWA. Extension drafted objectives and position descriptions; FmHA reported on the time schedule for completing the initial SIRWA study; and SCS reported on water impoundment areas and funding available. SICOG wrote grant applications and reported on and presented the seven-county SIRWA area signup map, which was completed by SICOG and Extension.

All four agencies worked closely with and provided guidance to the SIRWA board as it selected and hired a consultant engineering firm and an area water coordinator. The water coordinator was hired under IGA with Federal funds from the Community Services Administration. The coordinator is housed in the Ringgold County Extension Office and works closely with ES, FmHA, SCS, and SICOG while coordinating county and SIRWA efforts. The consultant engineering firm was hired under IGA with Federal grants from HUD and EPA. In all, \$62,000 of grant money was provided by these three Federal agencies and matched with \$21,715 of local funds.

Because of the joint efforts of the USDA agencies and SICOG, a rural water system for Region XIV in Iowa is approaching reality. Over 4,000 members have signed user agreements; the consultant engineering firm has completed elements 1, 2, and 4 of the SIRWA water study, with the entire preliminary report to be completed about October 1, 1976. SIRWA has incorporated and is becoming less reliant on agency help.

Table 1 -- Technical and educational services of USDA and cooperating State agencies in support of nonmetropolitan planning districts, fiscal year 1976

Services provided and agency responsible	Area of service input (in man-years)		
	National	State	Planning district
Soil Conservation Service - Technical information and interpretations concerning soil and water resources; assistance in the establishment and operation of regional planning programs	---	42.5	111.5
Farmers Home Administration - Information and guidance on housing development, planning of community services, and loan and grant financing for community development; assistance in the organization and operation of regional planning programs	---	14.1	36.4
Rural Electrification Administration - Advisory services to electric and telephone borrowers participating in and supporting regional planning programs	---	---	1.0
Forest Service - Technical information and guidance, data interpretations, and other planning aids related to forest resources	.4	10.0	10.0
Cooperative Extension Service - Educational assistance to State and local agencies in the organization of regional planning programs, with particular emphasis on community relations, intergovernmental coordination, and plan implementation	1.2	60.1	138.0
Economic Research Service - Establishment and operation of an information system and analytical work on district planning by the States and Federal departments	---	---	8.7
Rural Development Service - Coordination of Federal services with State and local governments	3.5	---	-----
TOTAL	5.1	126.7	305.6

Table 2 -- Nonmetropolitan Planning Districts

<u>State</u>	<u>No. Agencies</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Alabama	2	210,016
Alaska	4	62,000
Arizona	4	90,000
Arkansas	9	244,300
California	7	223,000
Colorado	13	100,000
Connecticut	7	140,000
Delaware	0	0
Florida	1	83,000
Georgia	1	367,977
Hawaii	0	0
Idaho	5	102,000
Illinois	10	247,600
Indiana	9	218,300
Iowa	10	200,000
Kansas	9	251,300
Kentucky	1	448,750
Louisiana	5	242,400
Maine	9	170,000
Maryland	1	13,300
Massachusetts	4	89,600
Michigan	7	164,200
Minnesota	11	254,000
Mississippi	1	295,491
Missouri	16	401,720
Montana	6	85,000
Nebraska	2	25,000
Nevada	1	10,000
New Hampshire	6	210,000
New Jersey	0	0
New Mexico	6	186,000
New York	3	151,000
North Carolina	1	357,024
North Dakota	8	151,034
Ohio	4	177,400
Oklahoma	9	266,500
Oregon	10	142,000
Pennsylvania	14	349,000
Puerto Rico	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0
South Carolina	4	256,826
South Dakota	6	35,390
Tennessee	1	195,548
Texas	3	136,200
Utah	2	22,000
Vermont	13	205,000
Virgin Islands	0	0



<u>State</u>	<u>No. Agencies</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Virginia	15	439,836
Washington	9	111,000
Washington, D. C.	0	0
West Virginia	6	131,000
Wisconsin	7	180,307
Wyoming	3	62,661





